



SR 99 NORTH MULTI-MODAL CORRIDOR STUDY

**Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #2  
November 5, 2001  
Draft - Meeting Summary**

**Agenda**

- I. Introduction and Agenda Review**
- II. Review of SAC Member Issues and Revised Materials from 8/27 SAC meeting**
- III. Results of Corridor Deficiency Analysis**
  - Existing traffic conditions
  - Study area hot spots (access, mobility, accidents, and transit)
  - Site specific pedestrian issues
- IV. Improvement Approach**
  - Examples of improvement options
  - Evaluation criteria
- V. Related Studies**
  - Alaska Way Viaduct
  - City of Shoreline's Aurora study
  - South Lake Union Activities
- VI. Stakeholder Advisory Committee questions, issues, and comments**

**Next SAC Meeting – February 11, 2002**  
Phinney Neighborhood Center

## Stakeholder Advisory Committee members present:

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Warren Aakervik, Jr.</b><br>Ballard Intermodal North<br>Manufacturing Industrial<br>Center (BINMIC) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Clarice Keegan (Alt.)</b><br>Aurora Ave. Merchants<br>Assn.  | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Marty Spiegel</b><br>Greenwood/Phinney<br>Community Council       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Carroll Boone</b><br>King County Traffic Safety<br>Coalition                             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Ref Lindmark</b><br>Greenlake                                | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Jean Sundborg (Alt)</b><br>Uptown/Queen Anne –<br>Uptown Alliance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Susie Burke</b><br>Fremont Neighborhood<br>Council                                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Sue Linnabary (Alt)</b><br>Haller Lake Land Use              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Barbara Van Defen</b><br>Bicycle Advisory Board        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>John Coney</b><br>Transportation Chair<br>Uptown/Queen Anne –<br>Uptown Alliance         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Chris MacKenzie</b><br>Weaving Wallingford                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Paulette Gust</b> , Citizen<br>and transit rider       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Jo Dawson</b><br>Broadview/Bitter<br>Lake/Haller Lake<br>Community Council                          | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>James Mueller</b><br>Vulcan NW  |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Mike Foley</b> , Transportation<br>Chair<br>South Lake Union Planning<br>Committee                  | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Roy Nelson (Alt)</b><br>South Lake Union<br>Planning Committee          |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Faye Garneau</b><br>Aurora Ave. Merchants<br>Assn.                                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Jerry Owens</b><br>Aurora – Licton Springs<br>Planning Group |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Tony Gomez (Alt)</b><br>King County Traffic Safety<br>Coalition                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Ron Sheck</b><br>Weaving Wallingford                         |   |

## Project Management Team

**Charlie Howard**, WSDOT  
**Nytasha Sowers**, WSDOT  
**Karl Westby**, Entranco  
**Fen Hsiao**, PRR

*The following is a summary of presentations given, issues raised, actions undertaken or recommendations made. When possible, lengthy discussions have been summarized into themes or summary statements.*

## **Agenda Item I. Introduction and Agenda Review**

Nytasha Sowers, SR 99 North Project Manager, started the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Ms. Sowers said today's meeting is the second Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting. She asked the attendees to introduce themselves before she proceeded with the meeting. The attendees introduced themselves one-by-one.

Ms. Sowers reviewed the Agenda:

- Scope and meeting schedule
- Corridor Existing Conditions
- Evaluation Criteria
- Related Studies
- SAC Questions, Issues and Concerns

She said the primary objective of today's meeting is to show the results of the Corridor Deficiency Analysis and to give a schedule update. She said staff will also be talking about related studies at tonight's meeting. At the end of the meeting, there will be time to talk about issues that haven't been addressed yet and time to answer additional questions.

Scope and Schedule:

- 7/01 – 12/01 Identification of transportation needs
- 12/01 – 6/02 Development of Improvement Options
- 6/02 – 11/02 Improvement Proposal
- 11/02 – 1/03 Final Report

Ms. Sowers said the staff will be finishing identification of corridor needs between now and the end of the year. During Spring and Summer 2002, the staff will be working with the study committees and the public to develop an improvement plan for the corridor.

Meeting Schedule:

- 11/5/01 Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)
- 2/11/02 SAC
- 3/18/02 Open House
- 5/13/02 SAC
- 6/24/02 Open House
- 7/22/02 SAC

Ms. Sowers said the SAC meetings have been scheduled in order to provide an opportunity for SAC input into each element of the study. Ms. Sowers said the SAC should have previously received an email of the meeting schedule.

Ms. Sowers reviewed the study's upcoming outreach activities. She encouraged the committee members to invite the project management team to speak to their organizations in order to answer questions and review the study results.

## **Agenda Item II. Review of SAC Member Issues and Revised Materials**

Nytasha Sowers reviewed the community issues raised at the 8/27/01 SAC Meeting. She said the staff is aware of the community issues raised and is reviewing them along with the study results and corridor deficiency analysis. She said staff also received community input via email after the last meeting. Most of the issues will be addressed in tonight's presentation.

Ms. Sowers said that although the "lack of east/west crossings, especially in the Queen Anne area" issue is valuable, it is outside of the program's study. She said the project management team recognized the importance of the issue but unfortunately does not have the budget to effectively evaluate east/west crossings.

Karl Westby, the study's consultant project manager, said this issue will be mentioned in their final report and they will encourage follow-up steps.

Charlie Howard, Director of the Planning and Policy Office, said they will also be talking about the Viaduct project that might have an effect on this issue.

Ms. Sowers said that if feasible, the Alaskan Way Viaduct project may recommend connecting several east-west streets that cross Aurora south of Mercer Street. Ms. Sowers turned the meeting over to Mr. Westby to discuss the results of the corridor deficiency analysis.

## **Agenda Item III. Results of Corridor Deficiency Analysis**

Karl Westby said that through the Summary Findings the staff was able to get a feel for what the project will look like in the future. He said the state is aware that the accidents along the corridor are an issue.

Mr. Westby presented section of the study corridor is ranked as the third worst high accident corridor in the state – according to the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)'s ranking of non-limited access state roads.

Mr. Sheck, Weaving Wallingford, asked if the numbers from the findings are annualized figures. Ms. Sowers said the numbers are taken from a four-year period.

Mr. Westby said safety is a big issue along the corridor. Most of the corridor has a failing safety level. He said that up and down the corridor there are safety issues and there are different ways to deal with them.

Ms. Garneau said this figure does not cover Battery St. and 145<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Westby confirmed this.

Ms. Sowers said the High Accident Corridor (HAC) is from the Battery tunnel to 59<sup>th</sup>. She said the bottom two bullets on the slide relate to the first bullet.

Ms. Garneau said these accidents are outside of the corridor. Mr. Westby said yes.

Mr. Westby said the staff divided the corridor into subsections for the purpose of the study. When the staff develops their corridor solutions, they will have recommendations for each subset. He said the south end of the corridor looks and feels different from the north end. He said the corridor is divided per the nature of the facility changes.

Mr. Westby displayed maps of each segment. Ms. Sowers passed out handouts of the maps.

### **Segment 1 (Battery Street Tunnel to Raye Street):**

Mr. Westby said the design speeds of this segment do not match the vehicle speeds.

Ms. Linnabary said the handout mentions the segment being “too narrow” but does not specify what the current measurement is. Mr. Westby said the measurements vary.

Mr. Howard said the bridge lane widths are 9 feet.

Mr. Westby clarified the meaning of the design speeds not matching the vehicle speeds. He said that a facility is designed for a margin of error. The design speed of this facility is lower than what the staff has observed people driving. Basically, the design speed is essentially the speed limit but a lot of people are driving above the speed limit.

Ms. Garneau said the designated speed limit signs are 40 mph.

Mr. Westby said the lanes approaching the bridge are too narrow and the shoulders are substandard.

Mr. Westby said “stopping sight distance” refers to the ability to see a car coming around the corner and being able to stop before running into it. He said the first corner is at Howe St. and the second is where the facility continues north before the bridge. He said the study refers to bends.

Ms. Garneau said this is a stretch.

Mr. Westby said there are many factors in determining if a facility is substandard. One factor is if drivers entering the street from the side are able to see other vehicles while pulling out.

Mr. Westby said there are a high number of accidents before the bridge because there is not enough sight distance.

Ms. Garneau said the reason for the accidents is both sight and speed.

Mr. Westby said should be a higher bank because vehicles are driving at a high speed. Currently, the bank does not reach the height requirement.

Mr. Westby said the facility does not meet the clear zone requirements. The “clear zone” refers to the area beside the road that vehicles veer off into and that should be free of objects.

Mr. Coney said in Seattle, lampposts get moved into the pedestrian right-of-way (ROW) in order to extend the clear zone. He said this impedes on American Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines. He said his advisory board has its eye on this.

Ms. Burke said sometimes a truck mirror is knocked off when driving by a lamppost close to the curb.

Mr. Westby said the clear zone is for drivers.

Ms. Gust asked what the clear zone measurement requirement is. Mr. Westby said there is a 2-foot minimum.

Ms. Gust said the pedestrian area and the clear zone should not be combined.

Mr. Westby said at this point, they appreciate the input. He said the next step in the process is taking the information and deciding what to do with it. He said they might do nothing with the information or they might really focus on it.

Mr. Westby said "access management" refers to the median treatment, access on the outside of the roadway, etc. He said there are several places in the corridor that have substandard access management.

Mr. Westby said the neighborhood issues include adding an Aurora St. crossing for pedestrians and bike use.

Mr. Westby reviewed the handout illustrating accidents within the corridor segment. He said the color green indicates the high accident corridor. He said the color red notes high accident locations.

Ms. Sowers said this is what they are referring to with the ranking.

Mr. Westby said the pink area is related to the clear zone. He said the all the data in the handouts refer to a two and a half year study period from mid-1998 to 2000.

He said the light blue color indicates accidents involving rear ends. He said these accidents are typically due to congestion and limited sight distance.

Mr. Westby said the fixed object accidents involve barriers, boulders and other movable objects.

Mr. Sheck asked if they know what speed the drivers involved in the accidents were driving.

Mr. Westby said he does not have this information on hand but can break it down.

Mr. Howard said the average speed is higher than the design speed.

## **Segment 2:**

Mr. Westby said again, the design speeds are not the same as the vehicle speeds.

He said the narrow lane width in this segment is a big issue.

Ms. Van Defen asked when the bridge will be retrofitted.

Ms. Burke said it will be retrofitting with rollers and is a long way from being rebuilt.

Ms. Van Defen said she thought it might be scheduled soon.

Mr. Westby said there are lots of studies about it but does not think it will be replaced soon. He said the SR 99 study is considering proposing changes that may include removing one sidewalk in order to add lanes. He said they will address this during the next step of alternative analysis.

Ms. Sowers said are they are aware that several neighborhoods want barrier separation between north and south bound lanes on the bridge.

Ms. Burke said the big issue in Fremont is to have north access.

Mr. Westby said the level of service in the segment is failing.

Mr. Coney asked what happened to the anti-collision barrier? Why is it not included in the results? Mr. Westby said it was an oversight and fits into the discussion on alternatives. He said that currently the layout of the bridge does not leave room for a barrier.

Mr. Coney asked what alternative treatment would reduce the bridge's speed to 25 mph. Mr. Westby said they will address safety issues but it will also affect mobility.

Mr. Howard said most people are traveling over the speed limit anyway. He said people feel like this section is a freeway and treat it like that. He said just changing the speed limit will not help.

Ms. Sowers said this concern is noted.

Mr. Coney said this area involves fatalities.

Ms. Van Defen asked what the average speed is. Mr. Sowers said police have clocked people at up to 70 mph on a Friday afternoon.

Mr. Westby reviewed a breakdown of accidents. He said the total number of accidents is not large but the segment is small. He said rear end accidents account for the largest number of accidents. Congestion, sight distance and speed all factor into this.

Mr. Coney asked where the fatal head-on accidents are located in the handout. Mr. Westby said this is not shown because the handout only notes the total number of accidents. He said they will be pointing out the location of fatalities in the next section of the presentation that includes alternatives.

Ms. Sowers said the other parts of the presentation include this information.

Ms. Gust said parked car information is also on other handouts but not this one.

### **Segment 3:**

Mr. Westby said this segment runs just north of the bridge from Bridgeway to Greenlake. He said the red section goes all the way up.

He said there is a failing level of service in this section.

Mr. Westby said it is in this segment that they begin seeing street parking design deficiencies. He said street parking is not shown as a standard element of WSDOT's design standards manual.

Ms. Garneau asked if the manual is for both new and old construction.

Mr. Howard said the speed and access clarification in this segment does not comply with the standard but staff is not necessarily going to make it comply.

Ms. Garneau asked if they have different standards for old facilities than they do for the new ones. Mr. Howard said there are not different standards.

Ms. Gust asked if the exclusive bicycle crossings are for pedestrians too. Mr. Westby said yes, they are for non-motorized traffic.

Mr. Westby said sideswipe accidents are becoming a more predominant problem.

Mr. Westby said the study represents all hours of the day.

#### **Segment 4**

He said there is a sub-standard median barrier where it ends just past Greenlake. He said it does not meet current standards.

Ms. Keegan asked where trees will be planted. Mr. Westby said they will be included in some median sections. He said this issue will be included in the alternative analysis but they are trying not to evaluate it at this point.

Ms. Keegan said they cannot put the trees in sidewalks because there is not enough room for wheelchairs as it is.

Ms. Garneau said there is no way people can walk in between trees on the sidewalks. They are already narrow.

Mr. Westby said they will decide later on how to incorporate all these elements and tradeoffs.

Mr. Westby said from this segment north, there are many businesses. He said the median access opens up.

Ms. Gust asked if there any important differences between angle accidents and driveway accidents. Mr. Westby said angle accidents usually involve cannonball driveways. He said they have breakdowns of where and how the accidents occurred. He said it is key to notice the sharp increase in these types of accidents.

Mr. Gomez asked if the accidents involve mostly left turns. Mr. Westby said yes.



Mr. Westby said in this corridor segment there are narrow lane widths and parking and objects close to the roadway.

Ms. Garneau said that a pedestrian crossing at 92<sup>nd</sup> is dumb.

Mr. Owens said 90<sup>th</sup> and Aurora is one of the worst accident spots in the state.

Ms. Garneau said there is no reason for a crossing at 92<sup>nd</sup>. Mr. Westby said there is an increase in pedestrian accidents in this segment. He said this is the reason for this recommendation.

### **Segment 6:**

Mr. Westby said there are neighborhood recommendations for cross walks and streetscape aesthetic improvements.

Ms. Keegan said there are not any real residential areas south of 115th. She said it is mostly businesses and the cemetery. She said this is mostly true between 105<sup>th</sup> and 115th.

Ms. Linnabary said there are many bus stops, though.

Ms. Keegan said the neighborhood issues do not make sense. She asked why this area has been separated into its own segment. Mr. Westby said the segments were taken out of adopted local plans.

Ms. Burke asked why this section was picked off. Mr. Westby suggested staff review the segments again with the groups that put together the locals plans. He said the segments were identified by a technical steering committee.

Mr. Howard said the segments operate differently because of the cemetery.

Mr. Westby said on the north end there is a business access and transit (BAT) lane.

Ms. Garneau said this segment should be a part of the previous segment.

Ms. Gust said the lane profile in this segment is also different.

Mr. Howard said the segments were broken up per the neighborhood plans.

Mr. Gomez said the crash findings are different between the two segments.

Mr. Westby said rear end accidents are predominant in segment 6.

Ms. Linnabary said there is much new housing going in between 105th and 110th. Mr. Westby said this showed up in the staff's projections.

### **Segment 7:**

Ms. Linnabary asked why the sidewalks are not part of the neighborhood issues. Ms. Sowers said they have a list of recommendations that are common to all neighborhood

plans and sidewalks are a part of them. However, today's presentation only includes lists that are neighborhood specific.

Mr. Coney asked if the staff is going to study the sidewalk for this section. Mr. Westby said they will be included in the recommendation.

Mr. Westby said there is a jump in driveway accidents in this section. He said they did not really see a direct correlation between the BAT lane and driveway accidents.

### **Key Items**

- **Staff is aware that several corridor neighborhoods would like barrier-separation on Aurora Bridge**
- **Most of the corridor has a failing safety level**
- **Drivers are driving faster than the design speed**
- **Lack of sight distance in the corridor**
- **Lanes before the Aurora Bridge are too narrow and the shoulders are substandard**

### **SAC Comments/Requests:**

- **The clear zone should not impede on or be combined with the pedestrian right-of-way**
- **Do not relocate structures into pedestrian walkways**
- **Pedestrian crossing at 92<sup>nd</sup> is unnecessary**

## **Agenda Item IV. Improvement Approach**

Mr. Westby presented the Design Deficiency Review that lists examples of improvements excluding No Action. He said that sometimes it is not feasible to make improvements.

Mr. Coney asked if "removing fixed objects" includes moving them into the pedestrian ROW. Mr. Westby said they might be removed entirely or removed and relocated. For example, utility poles could be put under ground.

Ms. Van Defen asked if Mr. Coney's question is addressed by ADA guidelines. Will improvements have to comply with ADA guidelines? Mr. Westby said yes, ADA requirements are very strong and the program must comply with them.

Ms. Van Defen said even though there are guidelines, they are not always followed. Mr. Westby said these are just potential options and are not recommendations.

Mr. Coney said that when civil servants ignore ADA and make recommendations that obstruct the pedestrian walkway, they are just taxing volunteer hours and taking money away from areas where it could be better spent. He said not complying with the guidelines just means spending unnecessary money on lawsuits.

Mr. Westby said there are not many sidewalks north of 85<sup>th</sup>. The design will be appropriate for whatever use is predicted.

Clarice said the staff does not address parking. Mr. Westby said this is an issue they will look at.

Clarice said does not think any improvements are necessary. She said she wants to know what other people want that her organization might object to. Mr. Westby said he has another slide that will talk about this issue in general.

Mr. Westby reviewed the Accident Analysis. He said many of the accidents are congestion related.

Ms. Burke said the pedestrian and bike accidents are not represented by a percentage on the handout, only numbers. Mr. Howard said they think there were 505 accidents.

Ms. Sowers said this number is over a 4-year period.

Mr. Gomez asked if they are close to getting data on behavioral accidents. Mr. Westby said they are in the process of going through the data right now. He clarified that behavioral accidents include those that are related to alcohol, rain, etc.

Ms. Linnabary asked if the streetlights are on timers. Mr. Westby said yes.

Mr. Coney said that on page 2, "fatal, head on accidents" is not a category. Mr. Westby agreed that this is not spelled out.

Mr. Coney asked what they will do to reduce these accidents. Mr. Westby said they are looking at this right now. He said some of the accidents include hitting fixed objects.

Mr. Hall asked how many fatalities include drunk drivers. Mr. Westby said they do not know yet.

Mr. Coney said the report ignores the barrier issue on the Aurora Bridge. Mr. Westby said this is not intentional and will follow up on this issue.

Mr. Coney asked if WSDOT has instructed the researchers not to address this issue. Mr. Howard said accidents are a serious problem in the corridor and they are trying to give data that shows this. He said they absolutely did not instruct researchers not to look at this.

Mr. Coney argued that this issue has not been considered. Ms. Sowers said they understand the sensitivity of the issue. She said over the next several months, they will take the findings and figure out what to do with them. She said these slides just show the overall picture.

Mr. Howard asked how many head-on accidents there have been. Mr. Westby said a total of six in the corridor.

Mr. Coney asked if they logged any fatal head-on accidents on Aurora. Mr. Westby said one.

Mr. Coney said they see a lot of head-on accidents on the Aurora Bridge. Mr. Howard said there has been only one head-on accident in two and a half years.

Mr. Westby presented the Mobility Review. He said they have found that transit mixed with regular traffic does not offer benefits. He said that sometimes transit has even poorer operating conditions than other vehicles.

Ms. Garneau said that transit has their peak hour lanes. Mr. Westby said the lanes are available to all traffic. He said buses are slowed down when they have to merge back into traffic after dropping/picking people up.

Ms. Linnabary said that the problem around 115th and Aurora is that the area is steep. She said people are not going all the way up the hill for the cars to get through the light. She suggested moving the traffic signal changer further back. She said there are also strange yellow lines in the intersection. Mr. Westby said they will note this concern.

Ms. Van Defen asked if transit is represented in the program. Ms. Sowers said yes. She said King County and Metro are part of the technical team.

Ms. Gust asked for the names of the Metro representatives. Ms. Sowers gave her the names.

Ms. Van Defen said most of the meeting's attendees do not understand how Metro operates, and would like more information. She said the program may recommend to increase HOV lanes and some attendees might have opposition to this. Therefore it would be helpful if more information can be brought to the group. Ms. Sowers said today's focus is only to study the results of the improvement options.

Ms. Keegan said they are interested in everything that happens to the street, not only the buses. She said if they give buses a dedicated lane it will cut down on mobility. She said many people will go down neighborhood streets instead. She said there is concern among every residential group along Aurora regarding this issue.

Ms. Gust said sometimes creating between transit for pedestrians and bus riders helps with this concern. Ms. Sowers said this issue has been noted.

Mr. Westby reviewed the Decision Process slide. He said the program is required to address state requirements. He said program staff has completed analysis and reviewed neighborhood plans and recommendations, as well as receive input from different groups. The combination of these requirements and people living and doing business in the corridor will be used to come up with alternatives and the preferred alternative. He said they will review the alternatives development at the next meeting.

Ms. Sowers repeated her request to meet with community organizations so the organizations are able to emphasize their specific concerns and questions. She said it will take several months to work through the issues. Many of the design requirements have to do with safety issues. She said they want to come up with a balance.

Ms. Sowers took over the meeting's lead. She passed out a Proposed Evaluation Criteria handout. She asked the attendees to review the document so they can talk about it at the next meeting.

She said that when they look at the different improvement options, this will be the criteria to determine what works best for the corridor. She said the criteria is based on what staff heard at the last meeting with the program partners. She said the criteria should be used as a tool when looking at improvement options.

Ms. Sowers said improving speed reliability refers to freight, bike, etc.

She said they have heard an interest in improving the corridor's appearance and streetscape. This could include greenery, benches, art, etc.

Ms. Sowers said the criteria includes the "Support of local and regional economy." She said staff is aware of the program's impacts to business, especially in Shoreline, adjacent neighborhoods, etc. This route is identified as a highway of statewide significance. But they also realize its local significance to people who use it for neighborhood interests. She said it is a balance issue.

Ms. Sowers said they have reviewed neighborhood planning recommendations in terms of improving livability along the corridor. She said staff is sensitive to environmental impacts.

She said they are determined to find solutions that can be implemented. She said they want to do something that will work.

Ms. Sowers said the criteria is based on the feedback from stakeholders, the partnering session, technical consultants, etc.

### **Key Items**

- **Transit runs worse than GP**
- **WSDOT handed out proposed improvement criteria**

### **SAC Comments/Requests:**

- **The group requested that project improvements meet ADA guidelines**
- **Parking is a concern**
- **Head-on collisions are a concern (Aurora Bridge)**
- **Neighborhoods concerned that improvements will cause traffic on SR 99 to move onto residential streets**

### **WSDOT Action Items:**

- **Per SAC request, staff will follow-up on barrier issue on Aurora Bridge**
- **Per SAC request, staff will look at moving the traffic signal at 115th and Aurora further back from the intersection**
- **Per SAC request, staff will provide more Metro operation information**

## **V. Related Studies**

Ms. Sowers reviewed Related Studies to the SR 99 study. She said there is information on the Viaduct project available on the back table. She said it is a fast paced project that is currently looking at design alternatives. By end of next year, they should have a PA. She said the Viaduct project will impact this study.

She said the Viaduct project is considering using the Battery St. tunnel for local access. They are looking at two new tunnels that would come up close to the Battery St. tunnel. There is talk about coming up before Mercer and after Battery St. to allow for more east/west connections. She said the two studies are coordinating with each other and are aware of each other's issues.

Mr. Howard reviewed the Viaducts' design alternatives. He said they are considering replacing the Viaduct with a more stacked design. This alternative would tie into the Battery St. area the most.

Another alternative is to cut and cover along the waterfront. He said this might include replacing the seawall. He said in some cases the seawall is non-existent.

Mr. Howard said they are not looking at additional capacity. Ms. Sowers said they are talking about 3 lanes north and south bound.

Ms. Burke noted the public meeting from 5-8 p.m. on Tuesday night.

Ms. Sowers said a handout for Shoreline's study of Phase 1 of the SR 99 project is also available in the back of the room. She said this project is surrounded by some controversy. There is opposition against the project. She said the SR 99 project will transition into whatever is approved for the Shoreline study.

Ms. Sowers gave a brief overview of the King County Metro study. She said they are looking at three sights for BRT. She said BRT includes more frequent service, buses lower to the ground to minimize handicap troubles, and intersection signal priority. She said this corridor, 99 south and a segment of roadway in east King County/Bellevue has been recommended for inclusion in this study. She said information on the study is available on the back table.

Mr. Coley said Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) will require fewer but more elaborate stops. He said this will have an impact on design. Ms. Sowers said the stops will also be more often - consolidated stops but more buses.

Mr. Coley said Metro plans to get people to stops with feeder bus lines. Ms. Sowers said this corridor is of a lot of interest to Metro and WSDOT in regards to BRT.

Mr. Gomez suggested running a public education campaign as the project's plan is developed. He said drivers should be aware that pedestrians and bikes have concerns and ROW. He said they should emphasize the need to be careful, obey speed limits, etc.

Ms. Linnabary said pedestrians need education, too.

Mr. Gomez said pedestrians are often highly impaired as well. He said sometimes they are drunk.

Ms. Garneau said a broader scope of education would be good.

### **Key Items**

- **Viaduct may want to use Battery St. tunnel for local access**
- **Metro considering BRT for either the north or south segment of SR 99 or the 148<sup>th</sup> corridor in Bellevue**

### **SAC Comments/Requests:**

- **A pedestrian safety public education campaign be included in the project**

## **VI. SAC Questions, Issues and Concerns**

Ms. Sowers asked if they had any other issues or comments?

Ms. Linnabary called attention to a program in Norway that involves all pedestrians carrying a small reflector. She said accident reports include whether the pedestrians had the reflector displayed or not.

Mr. Gomez commended staff on their good work.

Ms. Sowers adjourned the meeting at 8:49 p.m.